

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending. In the Ex parte Quayle Office Action, the application was stated as being in condition for allowance except for formal matters specified therein.

In particular, claim 10 was objected to since the phrase “further comprising” appeared to be incorrect and should be replaced by the phrase “wherein the voltage source further comprises” since it was thought that the “floating voltage source” was a further limitation of the “voltage source” in claim 1. Also, claim 11 was objected to since it appeared that the word “source” should be changed to --device-- in conformance with claim 1.

Applicant respectfully traverses the objection to claim 10 as the wording is correct as is. The “floating voltage source” introduced in claim 10 is not a further limitation of the “voltage source” in claim 1 but instead is a different voltage source that provides “power to circuitry coupled between said input and voltage reference nodes.” Although the claims are not intended to be limited to the specific embodiments disclosed in the patent application, claims 1 and 10 can be read upon the embodiment shown in FIG. 1 of the application as filed. In this case, the “voltage source” referenced in claim 1 corresponds with the voltage source 213 developing a voltage VREG relative to the input voltage VIN. And the “floating voltage source” referenced in claim 10 is not the voltage source 213, but instead corresponds with the Zener diode 205, the capacitor 207 and the current sink 206, which are stated in the application as collectively operating as a “floating power regulator.” See the sentence beginning on page 10, paragraph 20, line 9: “[t]he Zener diode 205, the capacitor 207 and the current sink 206 collectively operate as a floating power regulator to maintain a desired voltage source level across the Zener

diode 205, such as approximately 5 Volts (V) used as a power source by internal circuitry of the IC 203.”

In this manner, the “floating voltage source” introduced in claim 10 is not the same as, and is not a further limitation of, the voltage source introduced in claim 1. Thus, the language “further comprising” in original claim 10 is correct as is since introducing a new element not previously claimed in claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection and allowance of claim 10.

Claim 11 is amended as indicated in the Office Action by replacing the word “source” with --device--. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection and allowance of claim 11.

The Office Action summary also stated that the drawings filed with the application were accepted. Nonetheless Applicants are filing by separate letter Formal Drawings. A copy of the Formal Drawings are enclosed herewith for the examiners convenience. If approval is necessary applicant requests such approval of the Drawings.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that for the reasons recited above and for various other reasons, the objections have been overcome and should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits therefore that the present application is in a condition for allowance as indicated in the Ex parte Quayle Office Action. Should this response be considered inadequate or non-responsive for any reason, or should the Examiner have any questions, comments or suggestions that would expedite the prosecution of the present case to allowance, Applicants' undersigned representative earnestly requests a telephone conference at (512) 295-8050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2005

By: Gary R. Stanford  
Gary R. Stanford  
Reg. No. 35,689

Law Offices of Gary R. Stanford  
Customer Number: 26122  
Phone: (512) 295-8050  
Fax: (512) 233-2633